REMARKS

The Office Action, dated March 6, 2007, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present Amendment modifies claims 1-3, 6, 10-12, 20, 27 and 38-43 all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-43 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39 and 40 are in independent form. Applicant submits that the amended claims clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-43 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting in view of claims 1-158 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/809,595 to Applicant. Applicant notes that this rejection is provisional and therefore will address this matter when the conflicting claims in the co-pending application have been patented.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 40 and the succeeding dependent claims 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. This rejection is related to the Examiner's indication in Paragraph 6 of the current Office Action that "the language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result". The Applicant has added considerable language to the preamble and body of claim 40 in order to attend to the Examiner's comments in this regard. This independent claim language now more clearly specify the environment and results including "system for hosting", "on the Internet", "meeting planner client with a web browser computer", "attendee client with a web browser computer", "a central website server for providing central website server system processing", and "virtual

convention website program instructions". Similarly, the dependent claims 41 and 42 have additional claim language to more clearly specify the technical environment. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 of these claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner continues to reject the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky. The Applicant has added substantial language to the preamble and body of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 in order to attend to the Office Action. In view of the foregoing amendments to claims 1-3, 6, 10-12, 20, 27 and 38-43, as well as the following remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections.

The Applicant has carefully considered the references of the Examiner in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. Subsequent to these new amendments to the claims, the Applicant has also continued to take into account the Examiner's previous Response (*see* Office Action dated 09/22/2005, page 13): "In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims." The amendments are directed to the Examiner's current and past comments, and continue to further specify novel and non-obvious.

In addition to the amendments to claims 40, 41 and 42 discussed above, all independent claims 1, 39 and 40 have been amended to further elucidate the benefits of the invention, while assuring that the process steps and structural limitations are also able to stand alone. The amendments "A method for ~~conducting~~ hosting," helps to now assist on

focusing on the summary business needs discussed throughout the application. At least a portion of the fundamental and patentable novelty of the present invention in terms of the "hosting" methodology is set forth in the published specification (*see* page 12, lines 13-14 of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) with "the meeting planner <u>hosting</u> and controlling the event." Fittingly, the term "hosting" used in the application can also be read in terms of a derivative from the noun "host" which is defined in the <u>American Heritage Dictionary</u> by "One that furnishes facilities and resources for a function or event." Also, the further business benefit of "<u>on the Internet</u>", which is also indicative of these business methods - found initially set forth in the front-cover Abstract (*see* field (57) of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) with "on the Internet" and then throughout the specification – has been added to the preamble to further clarify the usefulness of the present invention in addressing business needs in the conventions and meetings industry.

The Applicant has further modified independent claims 1, 39 and 40 to further clarify the technical environment of the web browser computers used by the clients and the central website server – again explanatory of the hosted central website processing topology. The web browser computers are: "the at least one meeting planner client <u>with a web browser computer</u>" and "the at least one attendee client <u>with a web browser computer</u>". With respect to the exhibitor client, the Applicant has also added "at least one exhibitor client <u>with a web browser computer</u>" to all appropriate dependent claims, including claims 10, 11, 20, 27, 41 and 42. References to this topology limitation can be found initially set forth in the Abstract (*see* field (57) of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) with: "meeting planner clients (102), exhibitor/sponsor clients (103) and attendee clients (101), <u>all using web browser computers</u> and a <u>central website server</u> (200) <u>on the Internet</u> (104)".

Consistently throughout the Applicant's published specification (*see* WIPO WO 00/39694 A1), as well as referenced in the above previous paragraph, the exhibitor client is in fact distinctly and consistently presented as "exhibitor/sponsor clients". The singular form can also be found in many areas including: page 1, line 36; page 2, line 34; and, page 6, line 25. And on page 16, lines 8-14, the "exhibitor/sponsor client" processing is explained with: "Similarly, the exhibitor/sponsor client support program instructions 900 on the central website server 200 assist the exhibitor/sponsor client 103 in determining what conventions are appropriate for their participation, and in ordering and setting up a booth (or booths) and sponsorship at a convention in the virtual convention venue databases 300". Therefore, all appropriate dependent claims 10, 11, 20, 27, 41 and 42 have been amended to now include this "exhibitor/sponsor client" specification with: "exhibitor client with a web browser computer, sponsor client with a web browser computer or any combination thereof." Appropriately, claim 12, which is dependent to amended claim 10, is directed to the storing of cross-referencing fields to permit a one-to-many database relationship between the convention and the preceding-registered exhibitor clients or sponsor clients (from claim 10); hence, claim 12 has been amended to read: "The method according to claim 10 further comprising the step of storing cross-referencing fields from the convention content information in a relational database to allow an unlimited number of exhibitor clients, sponsor clients or any combination thereof".

Returning again to independent claims 1, 39 and 40, step a. has been further amended to now read or include: "receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer, and electronically storing in convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing, at least one

hosting policy and convention content information for a plurality of conventions the at least

one convention;".

First, within this process step a., the Applicant has expanded "convention

databases" to now read "convention venue databases", plus "at a central website server" to

now read "at a central website server for providing central website server system processing"

to provide additional clarification of the unique aspects and topology of the present invention.

In substantiation of the use of the central website server system processing and the

convention venue databases, Applicant respectfully cites Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 of the published

application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1, and their respective detailed descriptions (page 8, line

26 - page 15, line 5).

Next, Applicant has introduced the element in step a. of independent claims 1,

39 and 40 of: "at least one hosting policy". In support of this amended language the applicant

respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the specification (see page 41, lines 26-28 of

the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) "A meeting planner welcome

815 program provides the various policies and fee options of the virtual convention venue

processes"; and the "wide array of convention activity simulated with the program

instructions" set forth in field (57) on the front-cover Abstract of this same published

application. Please note that the meeting planner can select and input just one of these

various policies provided, that can determine the activity processing at the server; thus, the

receipt at the server can be singular form, "at least one hosting policy". We find another

specification supporting the use of a single hosting policy determining convention activity –

in this case attendance activity - at page 37, lines 9-13 "For example, cyber exhibit booth

display 715 OR the venue-based center "attendance" may be "free" or the attendee client 101

can pay via a credit card or other Internet common payment approaches." In this specific

example, we see that the hosting policy determining the attendance activity can be either free or fee-based - which could if necessary (e.g., fee-based), at the appropriate, point launch a registration process of website program instructions at the server, prior to continuing on to other virtual convention venue processes.

Next, the "plurality of conventions" has been changed from plural form to singular form within steps a. and b. of the independent claims 1, 39 and 40. Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to (*see* page 41, lines 32-36 of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) of the published specification and the line: "The sign-up your association and meetings 825 program instructions provide all processing to initially load and later change the control parameter rules and content information into the virtual convention venue databases 300 for each specific convention". (The term "each" was underlined in the published specification.) Also, the single convention specification for the physical center was found initially set forth in the front-cover Abstract (*see* field (57) of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) with "Additionally, the system supports and augments a convention being held in a physical or venue-based center (e.g., Moscone Center in San Francisco)". Subsequently, to properly claim the capability of the invention to process "a plurality of conventions", Claim 6 has been amended to now read: "The method according to claim 1 ~~further comprising the step of storing in a relational database cross-referencing fields from the meeting planner client to allow for the holding of an unlimited number of conventions~~ wherein the at least one convention is a plurality of conventions". The plurality form is specified (*see* page 10, lines 7-10 of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) which reads: "The meeting planners database 310 may include cross-referencing fields to the conventions database 350; this allows multiple conventions".

Returning again to independent claims 1, 39 and 40, step b. has been further amended to now read or include: "receiving, from the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer at the central website server, ~~from the at least one attendee client~~ a selection for convention content information of the at least one convention ~~from the plurality of conventions~~;". In order to improve the reading clarity of step b. and to appear parallel-like to the terms arrangement of step a. - where we find the "receiving", "from the client", "at the server" - step b. has been appropriately restructured. Then, "of one convention from the plurality of conventions" has been changed from plural form to singular form "of the at least one convention" as supported in the preceding paragraph above.

Independent claims 1 and 40, step c., and the similar process step d. of independent claim 39., have each been further amended to now read or include: "processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention website ~~computer software~~ program instructions ~~configured to create content for use~~ using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information in a virtual convention venue, a physical convention venue, ~~a convention activity~~ or any combination thereof; and". Specifically, "virtual convention website program instructions" has been applied to further indicate the program instructions at the central website server and specified on Figures 2 and 4 and within the application (*see* Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1). These process steps have all similarly been amended for the use of the "at least one hosting policy" as discussed in process step a. of each independent claim as introduced and fully described above, to now read in step c. (and the similar process step d. of independent claim 39) "using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information". In further substantiation of these terms, Applicant also respectfully draws the

Examiner's attention to page 15, lines 26-32 of the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1 which reads: "the attendee client global searches and control program instructions 500 on the central website server 200 assists the attendee client 101 in determining what conventions are appropriate for their participation". And on page 4, line 35 through page 5, line 1 of the referenced application we read: "the central website server releases stored database convention information and provides a wide array of convention activity simulated with the program instructions and the databases".

Finally, dependent claim 38 has been amended to read: "The method according to claim 1 wherein a plurality of conventions are facilitated from the central website server the convention content information is convention and visitor bureau content information". The convention and visitor bureau content information is specified several times in the application (see the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1) including at page 9, lines 21-22 with "convention and visitors bureau ("CVB") hosts databases", at page 13, lines 36-37, page 14, lines 27-32. page 18, line 21, and page 26, lines 35-37.

These above amendments to the Applicant's claims are responsive to the Examiner's citations and comments, and demonstrate the novel and non-obvious nature of the presently-claimed invention.

The Applicant has with each Office Action very carefully considered all particular columns and line numbers in the Salesky patent in their entirety, as well as the context of such passages as disclosed by the Examiner. No portions have been neglected. The above claim amendments distinguish the present invention from U.S. Patent No.

6,343,313 to Salesky and attend to the Examiner's detailed responses in terms of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated.

In previously-filed responses in this application, which are incorporated by reference into this Amendment, Applicant has presented conflicting and principal differences between the present invention and the Salesky patent. These arguments continue to be relevant. Taking the above new claim amendments into consideration, these summary differences include:

- Dissimilar elements/topologies - The employment of decentralized and unique communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent - have been omitted in the technology of the present invention. The 'communications server' connecting the 'source' and 'sink' client machines of the 'communicants' during a communication session" (col 3, lines 56-58 of the Salesky patent) as compared against convention website program instructions on a central website server connecting web-browser clients of the present invention. The relay machine - necessary relay software component with the formation of "client machines of the communicants" as required in the Salesky patent - is not necessary nor the same as the client workstations of the Applicant's invention. If one were to eliminate any one of the unique relay machines of the Salesky patent – a machine not found in the Applicant's invention – then the "computer conferencing system" technology of the Salesky patent cannot work; therefore, the Applicant's invention is not comparable to the Salesky patent.

- Dissimilar primary applications - The applicant's invention is contrary to the teachings of the Salesky patent, in terms of a centralized convention hosting

application as opposed to a the decentralized <u>webcast</u> and data block transformation relay service application. There are significant dissimilar technologies involved with the <u>hosting</u> using website hosting policy-directed processing of convention activity of the present invention, as opposed to the "tightly bound" (col 7, line 22) webcast <u>communications</u> sessions of the Salesky patent;

- Dissimilar intended use of convention content information - The applicant's invention is contrary to the Salesky patent in terms of the convention content information, together with the hosting policy for determining convention activity, determining participation of the attendee by website program instructions (in a system of ASP-type processing at the central website server) of the present invention, as opposed to the "stored meeting contents" (col 24, lines 66-67) - mere naming or description of the stored recordings and other communications session data streams - of the Salesky patent; and

- The invention utilizes a new principle of operation - The website program instructions using the meeting planner-loaded hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the databases at the central website server is a important principle of operation and is different than the Salesky patent.

Taken as a whole, the above synopsis of prior arguments (as made current), between the present invention and the Salesky patent demonstrate significant conflicting differences; hence, Applicant feels claims 1-43, as amended, are patentable over the cited prior art. Nonetheless, there are further argument matters to support and confirm that the

Applicant's claims, as amended, are not anticipated or rendered obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky.

The nonappearance of fundamental elements within the Salesky patent is indicative that the claims, as amended, were not anticipated by this prior art reference. The Salesky patent did not expressly or inherently use "website server", "website program", "website program instructions", "convention", "convention activity", "convention website", "convention venue databases", "policy" or "hosting policy". This nonappearance within the Salesky patent of such important website server processing elements is understandable because the Salesky technology did not anticipate a self-contained website with virtual convention website program instructions processing of a selection for convention content information from an attendee client, using a pre-loaded hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information, particularly as fully taught within the specification of the Applicant.

Moreover, the nonappearance of supporting technology within the Salesky patent further corroborates that the Applicant's claims, as amended, were not anticipated. Applicant's claimed invention describes substantial and detailed specifications which can be clearly read into the amended claims. This technology, which is fully taught within the application (see the Applicant's published application WIPO WO 00/39694 A1), describes and supports each and every independent claim element, as amended and expanded, including: "convention venue databases"; "central website server for providing central website server system processing"; "hosting policy"; "at the central website server by virtual convention website computer software program instructions"; "using the at least one hosting policy"; and, "to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information". Full page and paragraph references with explanations to these

amended and expanded elements and their respective technology descriptions and drawings can be found herein above on pages 12-19 and in previously-filed responses in this application, which are incorporated by reference into this Amendment. Respectfully, the nonappearance of each and every element and the nonappearance of supporting technology within the Salesky patent militates in favor of patentability of the amended claims of the Applicant.

Also, the Applicant's invention goes against the grain of what the Salesky patent teaches, which further confirms that the Applicant's claims, as amended, are novel and non-obvious. With the technology of the Applicant's invention, necessary elements of the Salesky patent have been omitted. These necessary elements of the Salesky patent are the "presenter client conferencing software" (col, line 21), the "attendee client software" (col 7, lines 22-23), and the unique "client machines of the 'communicants' (col 3, lines 57-58). Within both of the independent claims of the Salesky patent we first observe the limitations of "network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display" (Claim 1, col 35, lines 35-36) or "maintains a version of a shared portion of a data set" (Claim 2, col 35, line 57). To accomplish the relaying of the shared portion of a "display" or "data set" we find within the Description of the Preferred Embodiment of the Salesky patent that "presenter client conferencing software" or "attendee client software" must be maintained. At column 7, lines 22-27 of the Salesky patent we read: "The presenter client conferencing software, which is usually distributed tightly bound with the attendee client software to facilitate presenter hand-offs from conferee to conferee, captures information (such as image, sound, or other output information) from a program or programs running on the presenter's machine and relays it to the server". This is a unique relay machine. We plainly see, also at column 7,

line 33-34, that the relay part of the machine is a software component within the Salesky patent and refers to "transporting a stream of shared-image data during a conferencing usage".

We further read within the Summary of the Salesky patent the underlying equipment-network-software topology at column 3, lines 56-58 which states: "the 'communications server' connecting the 'source' and 'sink' client machines of the 'communicants' during a communication session". Accordingly, the Salesky patent interconnections and decentralized technology, particularly between the "communications servers" and "communicant clients", would be inoperative in terms of the Applicant's amended claims, if the necessary relay software component at the "communicant clients" (Fig. 9A-9G, Fig. 10A and 10B) was eliminated – e.g., necessary elements within the system of the Salesky patent. In other words, if one were to eliminate any one of these unique relay machine elements of the Salesky patent – a machine not found in the Applicant's invention – then the "computer conferencing system" of the Salesky patent cannot work; therefore, the Applicant's invention is not comparable to the Salesky patent. Respectfully, no such mandatory relay software utility, with the forming of "client machines of the communicants", is necessary at the client workstations of the Applicant's invention.

In addition, we note that this above relay "attendee client software" and "presenter client conferencing software" at the "client machines of the communicants" also processes "stored meeting contents, or any other document" as a "data stream" before passing it into the "communications server" (col 3, lines 56-57) for further relay machine work. At column 24 line 66 through column 25 line 10 of the Salesky patent we read: "In addition to the stored meeting contents, any other document or data object might be uploaded and stored with the meeting (e.g., meeting agenda, minutes of a previous meeting, or supporting

materials). <u>Upload</u> is another type of <u>data stream</u> that passes into the system server and is <u>then</u> <u>relayed</u> to a suitable storage entity". Again, the Applicant respectfully argues that this relay "attendee client software" and "presenter client conferencing software" at the formed "client machines of the communicants" has been omitted in the technology of the present invention. And if one considers the Salesky technology without such a relay software component at the "client machines of the communicants", the references that were relied upon by the Examiner are inoperative in terms of the Applicant's invention.

To assist in precision that no such relay software component at "client machines of the communicants", as described in the Salesky patent, is necessary at the client workstations of the Applicant's invention, the Applicant has added appropriate language to the body of all independent claims 1, 39 and 40 to further clarify the technical environment of the web browser computers used by the clients and the central website server – again explanatory of the hosted self-contained website topology. The web browser computers are now described: "the at least one meeting planner client <u>with a web browser computer</u>" and "the at least one attendee client <u>with a web browser computer</u>". With respect to the exhibitor client, the Applicant has also added "at least one exhibitor client <u>with a web browser</u> <u>computer</u>" to all fitting dependent claims 10, 11, 20, 27, 41 and 42. We also respectfully affirm that the elements of the Applicant's independent claims – convention venue databases, a central website server for providing central website server system processing, at least one hosting policy, and virtual convention website program instructions – are all elements that are neither taught nor suggested in the Salesky patent, and are essential for a reasonable expectation of success of hosting at least one convention on the Internet as claimed.

Keeping in mind the above general arguments, we can now turn to Paragraph 9 of the present Office Action where the Examiner cited several references that suggest the features of the independent claims of the application. With each cited reference it is also important to consider the state and condition of the unique "client machines of the 'communicants' (col 3, lines 57-58) as technically required in the Salesky patent. As argued and documented above, the employment of communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – <u>necessary elements</u> of the system of the Salesky patent - has been omitted in the hosted technology of the present invention. The client relay machines are not necessary nor are they equivalent as the client workstations of the Applicant's invention. With the claims of the Applicant's invention - including "client <u>with a web browser computer</u>", "a central website server <u>for providing central website server system processing</u>" and "<u>virtual convention website</u> program instructions" - the <u>necessary</u> elements of these "client machines" within the Salesky patent have been omitted. Further, the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that the reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

Within Paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner initially references col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, (potential conferee) with respect to Applicant's "receiving from the at least one meeting planner client". Please note that the amended claim now reads: "receiving from the at least one meeting planner client <u>with a web browser computer</u>". The Applicant also takes note of the importance of reference (column 30, lines 15-24) and its use multiple times by the Examiner within Paragraph 9; and, this reference is reviewed in considerable detail below.

At first referenced col 29, lines 62-63 of the Salesky patent we read: "When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the

information on a meeting". Both the server manager 36 and meeting manager 32 of this reference are within the description of Fig. 11 of the Salesky patent. "Fig. 11 is a diagram of the example architecture for a single server with a single meeting, according to the present invention" (col 6, lines 9-10). The first portion of this reference - "When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the information on a meeting" – pertains to the architecture of the single server and is specified at col 29, lines 44-51 with "The primary component of this architecture is a server manager 36 (identified in this diagram as "ServMgr InfoPass"), which is directed by a meeting manager 32 (identified in this diagram as "MeetMgr TheCompany"). Meeting manager 32 is an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process (similar to a "daemon" process used with Unix and other operating systems)".

And further review of Fig. 11 depicts and legends both Meeting manager 32 and Server manager 36 within "Example of server architecture". Hence, both Meeting manager 32 and Server manager 36 are processes pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS); and just below, at column 29, lines 65-66, we read that "The CSS is an owned, evanescent, quiescent, interrupt-driven process". And at the beginning of the Salesky patent, at column 2, lines 24-27, we read the definition of "meeting" with: "In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a "meeting." Therefore, the reference (col 29, lines 62-63) is directed solely to system command processes between the Meeting manager 32 process and the Server manager 36 process within and pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS). Thus, the Meeting manager 32 process of the Salesky patent is not the same as the "meeting planner client" and "the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer" used in the amended claims.

Continuing with the second portion of the reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee), which appears several times within Paragraph 9, we read: "A potential conferee 17(a) has navigated his or her WWW browser to Web server 30(a), and has asked through the Web page presented to connect to the meeting (as described above in the discussion of FIG. 2). There may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b),(c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager or its database 34 (called here "Meeting DB"). The meeting manager uses this database to hold information concerning the meeting (the database need not be on the same computer as the meeting manager)".

Looking at the opening sentence of this reference we read: "A potential conferee 17(a) has navigated his or her WWW browser to Web server 30(a), and has asked through the Web page presented to connect to the meeting (as described above in the discussion of FIG. 2)." Fig. 2 is a drawing showing "a flowchart illustrating the connection of a conferee client computer to a conference server" (col 4, lines 53-54). Inspection of Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, the Examiner can observe from the START at Conferee client 17, that the scheme for (conferee locates a conference listing) is illustrated by the very first flowchart box – "Conferee locates WWW URL for a conference". Notably, this flowchart method box is depicted wholly within the Conferee client 17 without any arrows showing communication to the Conference server 14. Fig. 2 shows the first connection arrow to Conference server 14 in the third box down in the Conferee client 17 process – "Conferee points browser to conference URL, provides keyword if needed" - well after the conference URL has already been located from outer-(conference server 14) sources, or simply "being told a URL" (col 8, line 36).

Looking again at the Fig. 2 flowchart, we see that once the Conferee client 17 is validated on Conference server 14, the arrow first comes back to the Conferee client 17 and

"initiates system client software" bringing into being the unique communicants machines with a relay software component. This conferee software for the presenter client can be found throughout the Salesky patent, summarized at column 2, lines 29-34 with "Conferencing software on the presenter client computer captures a portion of the screen display of the presenter client and sends the captured region (after possibly compressing it or applying other transformations) to the conference server". The attendee client software at column 2, lines 39-43, is used "to begin the conferencing session for that attendee, this action initiates the attendee client conferencing software. The attendee client then obtains a current view of the captured region from the conference server".

Continuing now past the opening sentence of this cited reference, which specifically quoted "the discussion of Fig. 2", we then read: "There may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b),(c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager or its database 34 (called here "Meeting DB"). The meeting manager uses this database to hold information concerning the meeting (the database need not be on the same computer as the meeting manager)". Review of 30(b) and 30(c) on Fig. 11 of the Salesky patent depicts "Alternate connector" and "Another alternate connector" respectively. The term "connector" ("alternate connector", etc.) is not found within the description of the Salesky patent. And, references "30(b),(c)" (nor "30(b)" and "30(c)", etc.) appear only in this solitary sentence. Review of the symbol used for 30(b) and 30(c) provides no clarification of these Alternate connectors; and, the symbol-shape used for 30(b) and 30(c) does not appear in the Fig. 11 Legend nor any other legends of the drawings within the Salesky patent. Significantly, the Another alternate connector 30(c) is not defined as a server or a client. With the immediately prior quoting of Fig. 2, 30(c) may perhaps be another means of downloading a client utility to connect to the server – but the reader is provided no added

specifications. With reasoning, this Another alternate connector 30(c) may perhaps be a similar process pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS) as found in the Meeting manager (32) processes pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS). Another alternate connector 30(c) may be a similar-type process like Meeting manager 32 with a "connection" to Meeting DB 34. Regardless, the unsubstantiated use of the term "connector" and the lack of specifications with respect to Alternate connectors 30(b),(c) in general, and Another alternate connector 30(c) and its connection to the Meeting DB (34) in particular, does not provide adequate basis to compare them to the Applicant's elements and claimed invention, as amended - including "the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer", "a central website server for providing central website server system processing", "the at least one attendee client with a web browser computer", "virtual convention website program instructions". Respectfully, Alternate connectors 30(b),(c) lack any suggestion that they can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

Thus, we argue that the first portion of the reference (col 29, lines 62-63) is directed solely to system command processes between the Meeting manager 32 process and the Server manager 36 process within and pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS); and, Meeting manager 32 of the Salesky patent is not a "meeting planner client" nor comparable to "the at least one meeting planner client with a web browser computer" of the Applicant's claimed invention. The second part of this initial reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) pertains to the system command processes interconnected with the CSS of the Salesky patent. Further, within the opening sentence of this precise reference the Salesky patent cites, with "as described above in the discussion of Fig. 2" (col 30, lines 17-18), which addresses the specification and first steps that initiate the communicants machines of the

potential conferee with a relay and data block transformation software component –
necessary initializing and operating elements of the Salesky patent that are not necessary in
the Applicant's invention. And finally, the unsubstantiated use of the term "connector" and
the lack of specifications with respect to Alternate connectors 30(b),(c) does not teach any
details, nor suggest the desirability of being a detached conferee, nor suggest the desirability
of conferee operations without first initiating a communicant machine. Taken as a whole, the
initial reference (col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) is not
comparable with respect to Applicant's "receiving from the at least one meeting planner
client with a web browser computer". And, the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that this
second part of the reference (col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee) should be modified in a
manner required to meet the independent claims of the Applicant.

Next, the Examiner references (14, fig 1; col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-
24) with respect to Applicant's "and electronically storing in convention databases at a
central website server". All independent claims have been attended to and amended (please
see pages 12-19 of these Remarks) to now read "and electronically storing in convention
venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system
processing". Fig. 1 of the Salesky patent "is a block diagram of a desktop conferencing
system" (col 4, lines 51-51) which depicts, among other elements, referenced Conference
server 14. And at referenced col 9, lines 64-67 of the Salesky patent we read: "In some
cases, server 14 might be operating without attendees. Such a configuration is useful where
the presenter wishes to "record" a session for later playback. Even a session with attendees
can be recorded for later playback, possibly including a recording of the voice conferencing.
These stored sessions might be stored in session archive 23 or elsewhere." And col 30, lines

15-24 is referenced for a second time and the Applicant's full analysis and remarks appear herein above.

Applicant argues that the referenced process is not comparable to the technology of the present invention. In the Salesky patent, the Presenter client computer 12, initiated as a distinctive communicants machine with, as we now further discern, a decentralized synchrony in the system with relay software component and special data-blocking-unblocking utility, at the outset has to process a "capture rectangle" in combination with the Conference server 14 "in order to provide synchrony in the system" (col 7, lines 57-65). If we then read the lines immediately following the Examiner's (col 9, lines 64-67), we find the synchronization again – this time the reverse processing side of the attendees but no presenter – at column 10, lines 2-7: "These stored sessions might be stored in session archive 23 or elsewhere. The shared image session can be synchronized with the voice conference by using the time stamps on the block data. When the recorded session is played back, it is an example of conference server 14 operating with attendees but no presenter". The "it is an example of conference server 14 operating" that is very specific and telling at this reference in terms of the necessary involvement in the server architecture as depicted in Fig. 11 - where conference server 14 is clearly shown with the dotted line as the Communications session server (CSS). We established earlier that all computers of potential conferee 17(a) also communicate [as specified above in the Applicant's remarks and analysis of Examiner reference (col 30, lines 15-24)] - "in order to provide synchrony in the system" (col 7, lines 57-65). Thus, the synchrony processing and software involved with the "'sink' client machines of the 'communicants' during a communication session" (col 3, lines 57-58 of the Salesky patent) is necessary not only for the webcast-type relay process between the communicants, but also for the data block transformation and/or other communication tasks

involved with the recorded session playback. Fig. 11 clearly depicts the network connection

with the Computer of the conferee 17(a) and the CSS as discussed in detail directly above.

The Another alternate connector 30(c) is not specified - as a potential conferee, a server, sub-

process, communications equipment, etc. The unsubstantiated use of the term "connector"

and the lack of specifications with respect to Alternate connectors 30(b),(c) do not teach any

details, nor suggest the desirability of being a conferee, nor suggest conferee operations. In

total, Examiner reference (14, fig 1; col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-24) is not comparable

with respect to Applicant's "and electronically storing in convention venue databases at a

central website server for providing central website server system processing". The

employment of unique communicants machines - that now must also provide decentralized

synchrony in the system with a relay and data block transformation software component –

necessary elements of the Salesky patent - is again not required plus has been omitted in the

technology of the present invention.

The Examiner next references (record a session for later playback, col 24,

lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings) with respect to

Applicant's "convention content information for a plurality of conventions". All independent

claims have been attended to and amended (please see pages 12-19 of these Remarks) to now

read "at least one hosting policy and convention content information for a plurality of

conventions the at least one convention". At column 24, lines 66-67 we read the "the stored

meeting contents, or any other document or data object might be uploaded and stored". As

discussed herein above, relay utility aspects of the "attendee client software" and "presenter

client conferencing software" at the "client machines of the communicants" also processes

"stored meeting contents, or any other document" as a "data stream" before passing it into the

"communications server" (col 3, lines 56-57) for further relay machine work. At column 24

line 66 through column 25 line 10 of the Salesky patent we further read the "data stream" "upload" and subsequent CSS "relay" processing with: "In addition to the stored meeting contents, any other document or data object might be uploaded and stored with the meeting (e.g., meeting agenda, minutes of a previous meeting, or supporting materials). Upload is another type of data stream that passes into the system server and is then relayed to a suitable storage entity". Again, the Applicant maintains that this relay "attendee client software" and "presenter client conferencing software" at the formed "client machines of the communicants" has been omitted in the technology of the present invention. The processes are not comparable.

Further, if we consider the Salesky technology without such a relay software component at the "client machines of the communicants", the references that were relied upon by the Examiner are inoperative in terms of the Applicant's invention. Then, at further Examiner reference (column 29, lines 34-37, several meetings), we find: "the method to be described below can also accommodate several meetings on the same underlying hardware and the conferencing software as provided by the present invention". Just beyond this line, we take note that this reference is directed to "multiple simultaneous communications sessions" (col 29, line 40); and, at the beginning of the Salesky patent, at column 2, lines 24-27, we took into account the patent-wide definition of "meeting" with: "In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a "meeting." We respectfully argue that "multiple simultaneous communications sessions" (col 29, line 40) is not comparable to the Applicant's "at least one hosting policy and convention content information for the at least one convention". In total, the Examiner reference (record a session for later playback, col 24, lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings) lacks any suggestion that the reference should

be modified in a manner required to meet the Applicant's amended claim "at least one

hosting policy and convention content information for the at least one convention".

Next, the Examiner references (17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) with respect to

Applicant's "receiving at the central website server from the at least one attendee client". All

independent claims have been attended to and amended (please see pages 12-19 of these

Remarks) to now read: "receiving, from the at least one attendee client with a web browser

computer at the central website server". As discussed at length herein above, Fig. 2 is a

drawing showing "a flowchart illustrating the connection of a conferee client computer to a

conference server" (col 4, lines 53-54). Inspection of Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, we learned

that once the Conferee client 17 is validated on Conference server 14, the arrow first comes

back to the Conferee client 17 and "initiates system client software" bringing into being the

distinctive communicants machines with a relay software component. The description of Fig.

2, starts at column 8, line 30 of the Salesky patent, and includes the Examiner's referenced

column 8, lines 34-42. This reference is directed at locator services prior to connecting to

Conference server 14, then at line 42-43 "allows the attendee client conferencing software to

start and to connect to conference server 14 itself". We respectfully argue that the

Applicant's claim, as amended, is "receiving, from the at least one attendee client with a web

browser computer at the central website server"; and, the Salesky patent is using a unique

communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component –

necessary elements of the Salesky patent. These client machines of the Salesky patent are not

necessary nor are they equivalent as the client workstations of the Applicant's invention.

The Examiner next references (col 8, lines 34-45), at this point with respect to

Applicant's "a selection for convention content information of one convention from the

plurality of conventions". All independent claims have been attended to and amended (please

see pages 12-19 of these Remarks) to now read: "a selection for convention content information of <u>the at least</u> one convention <s>from the plurality of conventions</s>". We note that reference (col 8, lines 34-45) of the Salesky patent is part of the paragraph specifying <u>Fig. 2</u> which starts at column 8, line 30. Therefore, considering reference (col 8, lines 34-45) - extended to line 49 - while also referring to <u>Fig. 2</u>, we observe no "selection for convention content information" per the Applicant's claims. We read within the Examiner's reference that "the conferee points a WWW browser to the conference listing, where the server offering this listing or an associated server validates the conferee and <u>provides information that allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect</u> to conference server 14" (col 8, lines 38-43) and then observe within Fig. 2, that all information passed is limited with respect to the communications session handshake, where the "conferee is validated", the "conferee computer initiates system client software", and the now "system client connects to system server" for the unique relay process of "Commands", "Pointer position", "Screen updates", and "Other services". We observe no passing of convention content information, particularly in terms of the Applicant's specification.

It is submitted that Applicant's claimed "convention content information" is encoded with the data structure of the (claim-included) "convention venue databases" and the "virtual convention website program instructions", which *defines functional and structural interrelationships* between the meeting planner client and the attendee client, the data structure and website program instructions (e.g., computer software), and the data storage device, CPU and network interface (e.g., hardware components), which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In total, Examiner reference (col 8, lines 34-45) lacks any suggestion that the reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the

Applicant's amended claim "a selection for convention content information of <u>the at least</u> one convention".

Next, the Examiner references (14, fig 1) with respect to Applicant's "processing the selection at the central website server by computer software program instructions" and (col 1, lines 49-64) with respect to Applicant's "configured to create content". All independent claims have been attended to and amended (please see pages 12-19 of these Remarks) to now read: "processing the selection at the central website server by <u>virtual convention website</u> program instructions <u>using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information</u>". Fig. 1 of the Salesky patent "is a block diagram of a desktop conferencing system" (col 4, lines 51-51) which depicts, among other elements, referenced Conference server 14. And at referenced column 1, lines 49-64 of the Salesky patent we read the opening paragraph of the Summary of the Invention of the Salesky patent. Within this reference we read: "An improved general purpose <u>data-stream computer network transport system</u> and, in particular, an improved desktop conferencing system is provided by virtue of the present invention. The desktop conferencing system is <u>used to display a shared collaboration among conference participants</u> ("conferees"), with one or more individuals located at each remote site connected to the conference. Typically, at any particular time some conferees are not able to modify the shared images, and thus they are "attendees," as opposed to "presenters." Preferably, only one conferee is the presenter at any one time. A pointer icon for each conferee can be displayed on the screen, and the conferee is able to modify the location of his or her pointer, even if the conferee is not one who can modify the <u>shared display</u> itself. Each of the pointers can be labeled to distinguish each of the conferees".

Because the Examiner has, at this point, referenced the opening paragraph of the Summary of the Invention of the Salesky patent, we take this opportunity to appropriately summarize some of the Applicant's current arguments concerning Paragraph 9. The applicant's invention is contrary to the summary teachings of the Salesky patent, in terms of a centralized convention <u>hosting</u> application - as opposed to - the decentralized "desktop conferencing system" by means of "data-stream computer network transport system" of "shared images" respectively. The applicant's invention is further contrary to the Salesky patent in terms of the convention content information, together with the hosting policy, determining participation of the attendee by website program instructions in a system of processing at the central website server of the present invention, as opposed to the "stored meeting contents" which we contend are mere naming or description of the stored communications session data streams, requiring uploading and downloading transformation in the decentralized processing. And Fig. 11 clearly depicted undeviating network connection with the Computer of the conferee 17(a) to/from Meeting manager (32), a <u>processes</u> pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS); and, the Another alternate connector 30(c) was not specified.

The Applicant further respectfully contends that the system and method claimed by the Salesky patent, performed in its normal and usual operation, does not and, indeed, cannot perform the system and method claimed by Applicant. The system of the Salesky patent is distributed with required and unique client-based communicants machines - bound to a communications conference server. The communicants machines of the Salesky patent are initiated with a relay and data block transformation software utility, that among other functions, also provides synchrony in the system. These necessary communicants machines are not necessary nor are they equivalent as the client workstations utilized in the

Applicant's invention. The communications session server (CSS) is used for utility software initiation of the communicants, the webcast-type relay process between the communicants (or between the CSS and a communicant), and data block transformation and/or other communication tasks involved with the recorded session playback. Further, we found no loading of convention content information by a meeting planner client similar to the Applicant's invention; respectfully, the references of the Examiner were directed solely to system command processes between the Meeting manager 32 process and the Server manager 36 process within and pertaining to the Communications session server (CSS).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from a convention after such convention content information and a hosting policy are loaded by a meeting planner client at a central website server for providing central website server system processing. The database design and computer programming supporting the process – at the server - of receiving such a selection and releasing appropriate content for such a selection is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, with the "processing" controlled by "the at least one hosting policy" included in the functional descriptive material to assist with the attendee client's navigational experience at the website.

Applicant has introduced the element: "at least one hosting policy". Again, making use of the term "hosting policies" also corroborates the extensive method characteristics of the claims; thus, the "using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information" with the clearly defines such participation in convention activity by the central website server system processing. The Applicant respectfully argues that this claim language of the "at least one hosting policy" in terms of determining the participation in convention activity by the central

website server processing as claimed in the invention is not comparable to the Salesky patent in general, nor the references cited by the Examiner in particular.

In total, Examiner reference (14, fig 1) (col 1, lines 49-64) lacks any suggestion that the reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the Applicant's amended claim "processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention website ~~computer-software~~ program instructions ~~configured to create content for use~~ using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information".

Finally, the Applicant has carefully considered Fig. 23 of the Salesky patent in terms of the Applicant's invention in general, and the amended element and use language of the Applicant's claims in particular: "at least one hosting policy" in process step a.; and, with "using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information" in process step c. At column 35, lines 19-21 of the Salesky patent we read: "FIG. 23 is a time vs. space diagram showing some typical applications of the present invention". And at column 35, lines 19-21 we read the only other reference in the Salesky patent with "One way of seeing the flexibility of the system is to refer to FIG. 23, where several applications covering different separations in time and space for the communicants are listed."

Within the Salesky patent, we first learned that the "communicants" were first referenced at column (3, lines 56-58) with: "In the more general case, the "communications server" connects the "source" and "sink" client machines of the "communicants"". And then at column 7, lines 22-27 of the Salesky patent we read: "The presenter client conferencing software, which is usually distributed tightly bound with the attendee client software to facilitate presenter hand-offs from conferee to conferee, captures information (such as image,

sound, or other output information) from a program or programs running on the presenter's machine and relays it to the server". This is a unique relay machine. We plainly see, also at column 7, line 33-34, that the relay part of the machine is a software component within the Salesky patent and refers to "transporting a stream of shared-image data during a conferencing usage".

As maintained herein above, the Salesky patent employs dissimilar elements and topologies. The nonexistence of fundamental elements within the Salesky patent is indicative that the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of this prior art reference. The Salesky patent does not expressly or inherently use "policy", "policies" or "hosting policy". Further, the employment of decentralized and unique communicants machines with a relay and data block transformation software component – necessary elements of the Salesky patent - have been omitted in the technology of the present invention. The 'communications server' connecting the 'source' and 'sink' client machines of the 'communicants' during a communication session" (col 3, lines 56-58 of the Salesky patent) against convention website program instructions on a central website server connecting web-browser clients of the present invention. The relay machine - necessary relay software component with the formation of "client machines of the communicants" as required in the Salesky patent - is not necessary nor the same as the client workstations of the Applicant's invention. And still further, the applicant's invention is contrary to the teachings of the Salesky patent, in terms of a centralized convention hosting application as opposed to a the decentralized webcast and data block transformation relay service application respectively. There are significant dissimilar technologies involved with the hosting using website policy-directed processing of convention activity of the present invention, as opposed to the "tightly bound" (col 7, line 22) webcast communications sessions of the Salesky patent.

Returning to column 35, lines 19-21of the Salesky patent, we read "One way of seeing the flexibility of the system is to refer to FIG. 23, where several applications covering different separations in time and space for the communicants are listed." The Applicant submits that Fig. 23 is clearly directed to the four phases in terms of "space" and "time" of the "client machines of the "communicants"" (3, lines 56-58) where the: Here/Now – the client machines of the communicants are "recording and previewing a presentation"; There/Now – the client machines of the communicants are "joining a real-time conference connecting participants at different, possibly quite distant, locations"; Here/Later – the client machines of the communicants are "reviewing an archived earlier conference as a participant"; and, There/Later – the client machines of the communicants are "viewing a prerecorded presentation or reviewing an archived conference as a nonparticipant".

The term "nonparticipant" ("non-participant", etc.) is not found within the description of the Salesky patent. And, references of "nonparticipant" appear only in Fig. 23. With the use of the term "communicants" at the column 35, lines 19-21 description of Fig. 23 perhaps downloading of the client utility to connect to the server is required – but the reader is provided no added description. The unsubstantiated use of the term "nonparticipant" and the fact that the Salesky patent did not expressly or inherently use "policy" or "policies" does not provide adequate basis to compare Fig. 23 to the Applicant's amended claims - in particular: "at least one hosting policy" in process step a.; and, with "using the at least one hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information" in process step c. Respectfully, Fig. 23 of the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion that the material can be modified in a manner required to meet the amended claims of the Applicant.

Finally, the Salesky patent lacks any suggestion of any electronic publishing of a website for a specific event solely with web browser skills. The Salesky patent did not expressly or inherently use "website server", "website program", "website program instructions", "convention", "convention activity", "convention website", "convention venue databases", "policy" or "hosting policy". The lack of these features within the Salesky patent of such important website server processing elements is understandable because the Salesky technology did not anticipate a self-contained website with virtual convention website program instructions processing of a selection for convention content information from an attendee client, using a pre-loaded hosting policy to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information, particularly as fully taught and claimed in the present application.

Clearly, the present invention is directed to the technology behind how the meeting planner client, exhibitor client or sponsor client can themselves, separately and interactively, encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate their distinct aspects of the central website with database updating processing and dynamic page information display, without any web-page-publishing or website programming skills, but rather solely web browser skills. The meeting planner client can also set hosting policies to customize the operation or processing flow of the virtual navigational experience of the exhibitor clients, sponsor clients and attendee clients. The present invention provides a precise technology, where the meeting planner client, exhibitor client or sponsor client can encode and fully maintain, at a central website server for providing central website server system processing, with virtual convention website program instructions, single or multiple-show or virtual convention website processes. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such hosting policies and convention

content information and electronically storing at a central website is novel and requires nonobvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps.

The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art. For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39 and 40, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting or augmenting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38 and 43 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-43 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. The Applicant hereby respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner should the Examiner maintain his rejections in view of the claim amendments and arguments. In this regard, the Examiner

is invited to contact the undersigned in order to discuss the best manner in moving this case

towards allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By_____

Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail:webblaw@webblaw.com